UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/849,746	09/05/1997	URS LOHER	LUDE14.313	4225

3624 7590 03/06/2003

VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C.
SUITE 400, ONE PENN CENTER
1617 JOHN F. KENNEDY BOULEVARD
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER
STAICOVICI, STEFAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1732	

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS-30

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	08/849,746	LOHER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stefan Staicovici	1732	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 December 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *17-26* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16 and 27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *05 September 1997* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). *26* .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 11, 2002 (Paper No. 28) has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicants' amendment filed December 12, 2002 (Paper No. 29) has been entered. Claims 1-2 and 7 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. Claim 27 has been added. Claims 1-27 are pending in the instant application.

Election/Restrictions

3. Claims 17-26 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Applicant's election of Group I in Paper No. 8 (filed October 1, 1998) is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Specification

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "Process for Manufacturing Components Made of Fiber Reinforced Thermoplastic Materials."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 27, the limitation of "the reciprocating process is performed *several* times" (emphasis added) is indefinite because it is not clear from the original disclosure what constitutes "several" times. Further clarification is required.

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 1-16 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In claims 1 and 2, the limitation that the "*entire* blank" is heated "*outside* the negative mold" (emphasis added) does not appear to have support in the original disclosure. Further, it should be noted that in Figures 4-6, it appears that only a portion of the blank is heated.

Further clarification is required. Claims 3-16 and 27 are rejected as dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-4, 7, 11 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackely (US Patent No. 3,850,723).

EP 0 373 294 teaches the basic claimed process of forming a fiber reinforced thermoplastic component including, preparing a rod blank (6) from a fiber reinforced thermoplastic material having a plurality of fibers (2) embedded within a PEEK thermoplastic matrix, positioning said blank in a mold, heating said entire blank inside said mold at a temperature above the softening (melting) temperature of the thermoplastic material and compressing said blank inside said mold to form said fiber reinforced thermoplastic component. Since the thermoplastic material is heated above the softening (melting) temperature, it is

submitted that the thermoplastic material flows inside the mold to take the shape of the mold surface (shaping the blank in the negative mold by virtue of the entire blank flowing from the heating stage into the negative mold) (see Abstract and Figure 6).

Regarding claim 1, EP 0 373 294 does not teach heating the blank outside the mold. Ackley ('723) teaches a molding process of a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank including, preheating said blank to a soft, flowable state in an infrared oven outside the mold, placing said heated blank in a mold and molding said blank under pressure such that said thermoplastic material flows and fills said mold (see col. 6, lines 1-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have preheated the fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank to a soft, flowable state outside the mold as taught by Ackley ('723) in the process of EP 0 373 294 because, Ackley ('723) specifically teaches that preheating outside the mold reduces molding time, hence improving productivity and lowering costs (see col. 5, lines 45-50).

In regard to claim 2, EP 0 373 294 teaches continuous (endless) fibers in a proportion of 60-70% by weight. It is submitted that a fiber proportion of 70% by weight is more than 50% by volume (see col. 8, lines 10-20).

Specifically regarding claim 3, EP 0 373 294 teaches forming a fiber reinforced thermoplastic rod and cutting said rod to form a blank (see col. 8, lines 10-30).

Regarding claims 4 and 11, EP 0 373 294 teaches continuous (endless) fibers (Elongated fibers) (2) arranged in a parallel direction (col. 8, lines 15-20).

In regard to claim 7, EP 0 373 294 teaches axially compressing (pushing) a heated pre-finished blank to obtain said fiber reinforced thermoplastic component and pulling said formed component.

Specifically regarding claim 13, it should be noted that EP 0 373 294 teaches the use of "continuous" fibers having the same length as the resulting molded article. It is submitted that the resulting screw (fasteners) of EP 0 373 294 is longer than 3 mm. Therefore, the fibers used in the process of EP 0 373 294 are also longer than 3 mm.

Regarding claim 14, EP 0 373 294 teaches that the fibers are enclosed by the thermoplastic resin (see Figure 7).

11. Claims 1-5, 7, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 02-145327 in view of Ackely (US Patent No. 3,850,723).

JP 02-145327 teaches the basic claimed process for manufacturing fiber reinforced thermoplastic components including, forming a fiber reinforced thermoplastic tubular blank (13), cutting said fiber reinforced thermoplastic tubular blank to form a pre-finished blank (16), positioning said pre-finished blank (16) in a mold (18) (negative mold), heating said pre-finished blank (16) at a given temperature in said mold (18) (heating the entire blank to a forming temperature in a heating stage) and axially compressing said heated pre-finished blank in said mold (18) to obtain said fiber reinforced thermoplastic component (22). Further, JP 02-145327 teaches that the fibers are enclosed by the thermoplastic resin (see Figures 4-6). Therefore, it is submitted that shaping of the pre-finished blank (16) in mold (18) by heating and axial compression occurs by flowing of the heated thermoplastic material of the pre-finished blank

during the axial compression stage (shaping the blank in the negative mold by virtue of the entire blank flowing from the heating stage into the negative mold).

Regarding claim 1, JP 02-145327 does not teach heating the blank outside the mold. Ackley ('723) teaches a molding process of a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank including, preheating said blank to a soft, flowable state in an infrared oven outside the mold, placing said heated blank in a mold and molding said blank under pressure such that said thermoplastic material flows and fills said mold (see col. 6, lines 1-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have preheated the fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank to a soft, flowable state outside the mold as taught by Ackley ('723) in the process of JP 02-145327 because, Ackley ('723) specifically teaches that preheating outside the mold reduces molding time, hence improving productivity and lowering costs (see col. 5, lines 45-50).

In regard to claim 2, JP 02-145327 teaches continuous (endless) fibers in a proportion of 70% by weight. It is submitted that a fiber proportion of 70% by weight is more than 50% by volume.

Specifically regarding claim 3, JP 02-145327 teaches forming a fiber reinforced thermoplastic tubular blank (13) and cutting said fiber reinforced thermoplastic tubular blank to form a pre-finished blank (16) prior to heating and axially compressing said heated pre-finished blank in said mold (18) to obtain said fiber reinforced thermoplastic component (22) (hot-forming process).

Regarding claim 4, JP 02-145327 teaches continuous (endless) fibers that are knitted as a braided string (13) and as such correspond to at least a length of the blank.

In regard to claims 5 and 12, JP 02-145327 teaches continuous (endless) fibers that are knitted as a braided string (13) and as such form layers of different fiber orientation along the axial axis, said orientation being between 0^{o}-90^{o} (see Fig. 1B).

Specifically regarding claim 7, JP 02-145327 teaches axially compressing (pushing) a heated pre-finished blank (16) in a mold (18) by using a punch (20) to obtain said fiber reinforced thermoplastic component (22) and pulling said formed component.

Regarding claim 11, JP 02-145327 teaches continuous (endless) fibers that are parallel to the axis of the blank (see Figures 4-6).

Specifically regarding claim 13, it should be noted that JP 02-145327 teaches the use of "continuous" fibers having the same length as the resulting molded article. It is submitted that the resulting screw (fasteners) of EP 0 373 294 is longer than 3 mm. Therefore, the fibers used in the process of JP 02-145327 are also longer than 3 mm.

In regard to claim 14, JP 02-145327 teaches that the fibers are enclosed by the thermoplastic resin (see Figures 4-6).

12. Claims 5-6, 12 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackely (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906).

EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) teach the basic claimed process as described above.

Regarding claims 5-6 and 12, EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) do not teach a laminated blank having fibers oriented in different directions. Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) teach a

process of manufacturing fiber reinforced thermoplastic components including, forming panels (36) from fiber reinforced thermoplastic material (PEEK), cutting a section (40) from the panel and machining said section (40) to form a machined blank (52) having a head end (54), a shank portion (56) and a tail end (58) (pre-finished blank) (see Figures 1, 4a, 4b). Further, Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) teach that the panel from which the blanks are cut are formed from a plurality of layers (more than one laminate) having fibers oriented in different directions (see page 7, lines 1-10), such as to form a "0/+45/-45/90" layup. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have formed a laminated fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank having fibers oriented in different directions as taught by Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) for molding a fiber reinforced thermoplastic component by the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723), as an alternative to using an extruded or drawn fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank, due to a variety of advantages that a laminated blank provides such as simplicity, cost considerations, simpler equipment requirements, increased process versatility and also because both references teach heating and axial compression of a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank, regardless of the method by which said blank is obtained. Further, it should be noted that both references teach similar materials, processes and end-products.

Specifically regarding claim 15, Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) teach controlling the temperature of the die as a process control parameter to adjust the orientation of the fibers. Although, Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) do not specifically teach the pressing speed as a process variable, it should be noted that the pressing speed is a conventional result-effective variable that is routinely adjusted for the purpose of positioning and aligning fibers based on the type of resin

and fiber employed. In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used routine optimization in the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) to determine an optimum pressing speed, due to a variety of unclaimed parameters such as the type of resin employed, the type of fibers employed, equipment availability, etc.

13. Claims 6, 8 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 02-145327 in view of Ackely (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906).

JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) teaches the basic claimed process as described above.

Regarding claim 6, JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) does not teach a laminated blank. Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) teach a process of manufacturing fiber reinforced thermoplastic components including, forming panels (36) from fiber reinforced thermoplastic material (PEEK), cutting a section (40) from the panel and machining said section (40) to form a machined blank (52) having a head end (54), a shank portion (56) and a tail end (58) (pre-finished blank) (see Figures 1, 4a, 4b). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have formed a laminated fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank as taught by Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) for molding a fiber reinforced thermoplastic component by the process of JP 02-145327 in view of EP 0 373 294, as an alternative to using a braided fiber reinforced

thermoplastic blank, due to a variety of advantages that a laminated blank provides such as simplicity, cost considerations, simpler equipment requirements, increased process versatility and also because both references teach heating and axial compression of a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank, regardless of the method by which said blank is obtained. Further, it should be noted that both references teach similar materials, processes and end-products.

In regard to claim 8, Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) teach heating the blank to a temperature of 725 °F (385 °C) and then under pressure, cooling the shaped blank until a temperature of 400 °F (204 °C). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have heated the blank at a temperature from about 350 °C to 430 °C as taught by Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) in the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) because, Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) specifically teach such a molding temperature and JP 02-145327 implies heating the fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank at a temperature above the softening (melting) temperature of the thermoplastic material.

Specifically regarding claim 15, Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) teach controlling the temperature of the die as a process control parameter to adjust the orientation of the fibers. Although, Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) do not specifically teach the pressing speed as a process variable, it should be noted that the pressing speed is a conventional result-effective variable that is routinely adjusted for the purpose of positioning and aligning fibers based on the type of resin and fiber employed. In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used routine optimization in the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view

of Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) to determine an optimum pressing speed, due to a variety of unclaimed parameters such as the type of resin employed, the type of fibers employed, equipment availability, etc.

14. Claims 8 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 02-145327 in view of Ackely (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Gotoh *et al.* (US Patent No. 5,223,526).

JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) teaches the basic claimed process as described above.

Regarding claim 10, JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) does not teach. a carbon fiber reinforced PAEK material. Gotoh *et al.* ('556) teach a carbon fiber reinforced PAEK material. Further, Gotoh *et al.* ('556) teach PAEK as a replacement for nylon (see col. 1, lines 44-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have used a carbon fiber reinforced PAEK material as taught by Gotoh *et al.* ('556) in the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723), because Gotoh *et al.* ('556) specifically teach PAEK as a replacement for nylon in case of high temperature applications, hence enhancing product quality. Further, it should be noted that the particular use of a certain material is dependent on a variety of unclaimed parameters such as availability, cost considerations, desired characteristics, weight requirements, etc.

In regard to claims 8, JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) do not teach a forming temperature of 350-450 °C. However, Ackley ('723) teaches heating a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank at a temperature such that it is soft and flowable (see col. 6, lines 4-5).

Further, it should be noted that because JP 02-145327 teaches that the fibers are enclosed by the thermoplastic resin (see Figures 4-6), it is submitted that shaping of the pre-finished blank in the mold by heating and axial compression occurs by flowing of the heated thermoplastic material of the pre-finished blank during the axial compression stage. Gotoh *et al.* ('556) teach that the molding temperature of PAEK is from about 350 °C to 430 °C (see col. 2, lines 61-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have heated the blank at a temperature from about 350 °C to 430 °C as taught by Gotoh *et al.* ('556) in the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) because Gotoh *et al.* ('556) specifically teach such a molding temperature is required for a PAEK material and also because Ackley ('723) specifically teaches heating of a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank at a temperature above the softening (melting) temperature of the thermoplastic material.

15. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackely (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Gotoh *et al.* (US Patent No. 5,223,526).

EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) teach the basic claimed process as described above.

Regarding claim 10, EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) do not teach. a carbon fiber reinforced PAEK material. Gotoh *et al.* ('556) teach a carbon fiber reinforced PAEK material. Further, Gotoh *et al.* ('556) teach PAEK as an equivalent replacement for PEEK (see col. 2, lines 52-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have used a carbon fiber reinforced PAEK material as taught by Gotoh *et al.* ('556) in the process of EP 0

373 294 in view of Ackley ('723), because Gotoh *et al.* ('556) specifically teach PAEK as an equivalent replacement for PEEK. Further, it should be noted that the particular use of a certain material is dependent on a variety of unclaimed parameters such as availability, cost considerations, desired characteristics, weight requirements, etc.

In regard to claims 8, EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) do not teach a forming temperature of 350-450 °C. Ackley ('723) teaches heating a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank at a temperature such that it is soft and flowable (see col. 6, lines 4-5). EP 0 373 294 teaches heating a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank in a mold at a temperature above the softening (melting) temperature of the thermoplastic material in order to soften the material (flowing state) such that the fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank assumes the shape of the mold. Gotoh *et al.* ('556) teach that the molding temperature of PAEK is from about 350 °C to 430 °C (see col. 2, lines 61-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have heated the blank at a temperature from about 350 °C to 430 °C as taught by Gotoh *et al.* ('556) in the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) because Gotoh *et al.* ('556) specifically teach such a molding temperature is required for a PAEK material and also because Ackley ('723) specifically teaches heating of a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank at a temperature above the softening (melting) temperature of the thermoplastic material.. Gotoh *et al.* ('556) teach that the molding temperature of PAEK is from about 350 °C to 430 °C (see col. 2, lines 61-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have heated the blank at a temperature from about 350 °C to 430 °C as taught by Gotoh *et al.* ('556) in the process of EP 0 373 294 because Gotoh *et al.* ('556) specifically teach that such a molding

temperature and EP 0 373 294 teaches heating the fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank at a temperature above the softening (melting) temperature of the thermoplastic material.

16. Claims 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackely (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of DE 37 39 582 A1.

EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) teach the basic claimed process as described above.

Regarding claim 16, EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) do not teach applying a surface seal. DE 37 39 582 A1 teach a process of coating a molten plastic material by applying a carbon coating to a mold surface, injecting a molten plastic material inside the mold, and depositing said coating onto said melt as the carbon coating comes into contact with the molten polymer. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a carbon coating on the mold surface as taught by DE 37 39 582 A1 in the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) due to a variety of advantages that such a coating process provides such as, reduced pollution, improved productivity, etc. and also because a carbon coated fastener provides for improved electrical characteristics.

17. Claims 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 02-145327 in view of Ackely (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of DE 37 39 582 A1.

JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) teaches the basic claimed process as shown above.

Regarding claim 16, JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) does not teach applying a surface seal. DE 37 39 582 A1 teach a process of coating a molten plastic material by applying a

carbon coating to a mold surface, injecting a molten plastic material inside the mold, and depositing said coating onto said melt as the carbon coating comes into contact with the molten polymer. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a carbon coating on the mold surface as taught by DE 37 39 582 A1 in the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) due to a variety of advantages that such a coating process provides such as, reduced pollution, improved productivity, etc. and also because a carbon coated fastener provides for improved electrical characteristics.

18. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackely (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Lee (US Patent No. 5,244,747).

EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) teach the basic claimed process.

Regarding claim 9, EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) do not teach the use of carbon or graphite as a release agent. Lee ('747) teaches that a carbon-based release agent is equivalent to a fluorocarbon-based release agent when releasing a thermoplastic material (see col. 2, lines 35-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided a carbon-based release agent as an equivalent to a fluorocarbon-based release agent as taught by Lee ('747) in the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) because, Lee ('747) specifically teaches that a carbon-based release agent is equivalent to a fluorocarbon-based release agent when releasing a thermoplastic material, whereas EP 0 373 294 or JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) teach molding of thermoplastic materials.

19. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 02-145327 in view of Ackely (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Lee (US Patent No. 5,244,747).

JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) teach the basic claimed process.

Regarding claim 9, JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) do not teach the use of carbon or graphite as a release agent. Lee ('747) teaches that a carbon-based release agent is equivalent to a fluorocarbon-based release agent when releasing a thermoplastic material (see col. 2, lines 35-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided a carbon-based release agent as an equivalent to a fluorocarbon-based release agent as taught by Lee ('747) in the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) because, Lee ('747) specifically teaches that a carbon-based release agent is equivalent to a fluorocarbon-based release agent when releasing a thermoplastic material, whereas EP 0 373 294 or JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) teach molding of thermoplastic materials.

20. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackely (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of JP 01-258918.

EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) teach the basic claimed process.

Regarding claim 27, EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) do not teach a multiple reciprocating system. JP 01-258918 teaches molding a round fiber reinforced thermoplastic bar at both ends by a multiple push-pull process (see Abstract and Figure 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided a multiple push-pull process as taught by JP 01-258918 in the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) because, JP 01-258918 teaches molding both ends of the bar having similar properties, hence improving productivity.

21. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 02-145327 in view of Ackely (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of JP 01-258918.

JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) teach the basic claimed process.

Regarding claim 27, JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) do not teach a multiple reciprocating system. JP 01-258918 teaches molding a round fiber reinforced thermoplastic bar at both ends by a multiple push-pull process 9see Abstract and Figure 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided a multiple push-pull process as taught by JP 01-258918 in the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) because, JP 01-258918 teaches molding both ends of the bar having similar properties, hence improving productivity.

Response to Arguments

22. Applicants' remarks filed December 11, 2002 (Paper No. 29) have been considered. However, Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stefan Staicovici, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 305-

0396. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM and alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard D. Crispino, can be reached at (703) 308-3853. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-7718.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Stefan Staicovici, PhD

Primary Examiner 1/24/03

AU 1732

January 24, 2003